

SENATE RECORD VOTE ANALYSIS

104th Congress
1st Session

Vote No. 370

August 5, 1995, 2:29 p.m.
Page S-11527 Temp. Record

TREASURY APPROPRIATIONS/Abortion Fringe Benefit, Life-Rape-Incest

SUBJECT: Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year 1996 . . . H.R. 2020.
Nickles amendment No. 2153 to the committee amendment on page 2, line 14.

ACTION: AMENDMENT AGREED TO, 50-44

SYNOPSIS: As reported, H.R. 2020, the Treasury, Postal Service, and General Government Appropriations Bill for fiscal year (FY) 1996, will provide \$23.1 billion in new budget authority (BA) for the Department of the Treasury, Postal Service, Executive Office of the President, and various independent agencies. This amount is \$367 million less than the amount provided in FY 1995, \$42 million less than in the House-passed bill, and \$1.8 billion less than requested by the Clinton Administration.

The committee amendment on page 2, line 14, would make a noncontroversial change.

The Nickles amendment would bar the use of funds appropriated by this Act to pay for abortions, or the administrative expenses in connection with any health plan under the Federal Employee Health Benefit (FEHB) program which provides any benefits or coverage for abortions, unless: the life of the mother would be endangered if the fetus were carried to term; or the pregnancy was the result of an act of rape or incest.

Those favoring the amendment contended:

We have finally reached the issue on which we should vote. First, the debate is not about the constitutionality of abortion, though if it were many of us would support a constitutional amendment to ban abortion. Second, it is not about the legality of abortion, which has never been decided by Congress, though if it were many of us would oppose passing a national law to legalize it. Third, it is not about in any way restricting the reasons for procuring an abortion. If it were, we would talk about Americans' opposition to sex-selection abortions and about their opposition to abortion for economic reasons. Fourth, it is not about at which stages of gestation an abortion may be obtained. If it were, we would talk about the frequency of late-term abortions, which most Americans

(See other side)

YEAS (50)			NAYS (44)			NOT VOTING (6)	
Republicans (40 or 80%)		Democrats (10 or 23%)	Republicans (10 or 20%)		Democrats (34 or 77%)	Republicans (4)	Democrats (2)
Abraham	Hatfield	Biden	Campbell	Akaka	Kerrey	Gregg- ²	Bumpers- ²
Ashcroft	Helms	Breaux	Chafee	Baucus	Kerry	Lugar- ²	Pryor- ²
Bennett	Hutchison	Conrad	Cohen	Bingaman	Kohl	Murkowski- ²	
Bond	Inhofe	Dorgan	Domenici	Boxer	Lautenberg	Stevens- ²	
Brown	Kempthorne	Exon	Jeffords	Bradley	Leahy		
Burns	Kyl	Ford	Kassebaum	Bryan	Levin		
Coats	Lott	Heflin	Packwood	Byrd	Lieberman		
Cochran	Mack	Johnston	Simpson	Daschle	Mikulski		
Coverdell	McCain	Nunn	Snowe	Dodd	Moseley-Braun		
Craig	McConnell	Reid	Specter	Feingold	Moynihan		
D'Amato	Nickles			Feinstein	Murray		
DeWine	Pressler			Glenn	Pell		
Dole	Roth			Graham	Robb		
Faircloth	Santorum			Harkin	Rockefeller		
Frist	Shelby			Hollings	Sarbanes		
Gorton	Smith			Inouye	Simon		
Gramm	Thomas			Kennedy	Wellstone		
Grams	Thompson						
Grassley	Thurmond						
Hatch	Warner						

EXPLANATION OF ABSENCE:

- 1—Official Business
- 2—Necessarily Absent
- 3—Illness
- 4—Other

SYMBOLS:

- AY—Announced Yea
- AN—Announced Nay
- PY—Paired Yea
- PN—Paired Nay

erroneously believe are illegal. Fifth, it is not about deciding the morality of abortion. If it were, many of us would argue that no "right" exists to justify the moral wrong of taking an innocent human being's life, created in the image and likeness of God. Instead, this amendment is about restricting Federal payment for abortion as an employee fringe "health" benefit to three very narrow circumstances. Under the Nickles amendment, the Federal Government would not subsidize its employees' abortions unless their pregnancies were the result of acts of rape or incest or unless their pregnancies threatened their lives. We believe that most Senators oppose taxpayer funding of abortions beyond these 3 narrow circumstances. We are pleased that we have finally had the opportunity to offer this amendment, and we urge our colleagues to give it their support.

Those opposing the amendment contended:

The Senate just voted to strike the House amendment. That vote basically preserved the right of Federal women employees to exercise the same complete freedom of choice as all other American women exercise. This amendment would reverse that vote except for two very narrow exceptions. If the Nickles amendment passes, Federal employees who are in very troubled pregnancies will be forced to carry their pregnancies to term if they cannot afford to pay for abortions privately. In some cases, they will be putting their future physical health at risk; a woman at risk of paralysis, for example, would not have her abortion paid for under this amendment. This decision is not one that Government should make. Each woman, with the support of her family and doctor, should make this decision. Senators who support choice must oppose the Nickles amendment.